UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,019	06/16/2006	Mikael Gisslegard	1510-1107	7395

466 7590 05/27/2010

YOUNG & THOMPSON
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, TRINH T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3644	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/27/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DocketingDept@young-thompson.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/539,019	GISSLEGARD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Trinh T. Nguyen	3644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Amendments dated 11/4/09 & 2/22/10*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-12,17-22 and 28-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 3,4,6-11,17-22,29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 3, the phrase "the discontinuous phase" is confusing since it is unclear if "the discontinuous phase" is referred to the "cross-linked rubber discontinuous phase" as claimed in claim 1 or another discontinuous phase?

In claim 4, the phrase "the rubber" is confusing since it is unclear if "the rubber" is referred to the "cross-linked rubber discontinuous phase" as claimed in claim 1 or another rubber?

In claim 6, the term "different" is vague and indefinite because it is unclear as to what the word "different" defines and/or intends to be encompassed.

In claim 8, the phase "< 0,20" is confusing since it is not understood what is being claimed.

In claims 17-20 and 29-31, the phrase "material or combination of materials" is confusing because it is unclear as to what "material" or "combination of materials" defines and/or intends to be encompassed since there are no definitions defining for "material or combination of materials" in claim 1.

In claim 21, the phrases "a sleeve (24)" and "a teat receiving flexible sleeve" are confusing since it is unclear if "a sleeve (24)" is the same or different sleeve as compared to "a teat receiving flexible sleeve"?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1,3-12,17-22,28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills (US 4572106) in view of Thomson et al. (US 2005/0058796).

For claims 1,6, and 21, Mills discloses a milking device comprising:

a head portion (2);

a sleeve (11), and

a separate milk tube (10), connectable with the sleeve adapted to be positioned on/over a teat in a close fit

a teat cup liner receiving flexible sleeve (1), adapted to be positioned on/over a teat.

Mills lacks to mention at least a first portion thereof comprises a thermo-plastic elastomers (TPE), especially a thermoplastic vulcanisate (TPV) comprising a thermoplastic continuous phase and a cross-linked rubber discontinuous phase material, exhibiting the following properties: a) a hardness between 25 shore A and 50 shore D; b) a Young's modulus between 0.i MPa and 50 MPa; c) a tensile strength above 0.5 MPa; and d) a minimum elongation of 50% without breakage.

Thomson et al. teach that it is old and well known in the art to use a thermo-plastic elastomers (TPE) material, especially a thermoplastic vulcanisate (TPV) comprising a thermoplastic continuous phase and a cross-linked rubber discontinuous phase material, in flexible tubing for milking device so as to reduce bacteria growth therein (see [0015]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the flexible sleeve of Mills so as to include the use of a thermo-plastic elastomers (TPE) material, especially a thermoplastic vulcanisate (TPV) comprising a thermoplastic continuous phase and a cross-linked rubber discontinuous phase material, in a similar manner as taught in Thomson et al., so as to reduce bacteria growth therein.

With respect to the limitation "at least a further portion comprises a TPE material different from that of the first portion" as claimed in claim 6, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the flexible sleeve of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include a flexible sleeve having different material portions, since using different type material is considered as a matter of design choice depended on its suitability for the intended use and/or the availability of the material, wherein no stated problem is solved or any new or unexpected result achieved, since it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the material used in Mills as modified by Thomson et al..

With respect to the limitation "a) a hardness between 25 shore A and 50 shore D; b) a Young's modulus between 0.i MPa and 50 MPa; c) a tensile strength above 0.5 MPa; and d) a minimum elongation of 50% without breakage", it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include the use of a thermo-plastic elastomers (TPE) material exhibiting the properties of hardness between 25 shore A and 50 shore D, a Young's modulus between 0.1 MPa and 50 MPa, a tensile strength above 0.5 MPa, and a minimum elongation of 50% without breakage, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. Also, since applicant did not provide a reason and/or showing any criticality as to why the thermo-plastic elastomers (TPE) has to specifically exhibited the properties of hardness between 25 shore A and 50 shore D, a Young's modulus between 0.1 MPa and 50 MPa, a tensile strength above 0.5 MPa, and a minimum elongation of 50% without breakage, it is believed that through trial and error during the testing procedure that one comes up with a desirable hardness or Young's modulus or tensile strength or elongation to meet the design criteria for forming a teat receiving flexible sleeve.

For claim 3, as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention except for the use of the discontinuous phase comprises a butadiene rubber; silicone; EPDM; or NBR optionally grafted with acrylates or anhydrides, or a combination of any or all of these. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include the discontinuous phase comprises a butadiene rubber; silicone; EPDM; or NBR optionally

grafted with acrylates or anhydrides, or a combination of any or all of these, since using another type material is considered as a matter of design choice depended on its suitability for the intended use and/or the availability of the material, wherein no stated problem is solved or any new or unexpected result achieved, since it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the type of material used in Mills as modified by Thomson et al..

For claim 4, as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention except for the use of the rubber is selected from the group consisting of nitrile rubber, styrene-butadiene rubber, butyl rubber, halo-butyl rubber, ethylene-propylene rubber, polyisoprene, polychloroprene, polybutene copolymers, and chlorosulfonated polyethylene. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include the rubber is selected from the group consisting of nitrile rubber, styrene-butadiene rubber, butyl rubber, halo-butyl rubber, ethylene-propylene rubber, polyisoprene, polychloroprene, polybutene copolymers, and chlorosulfonated polyethylene, since using another type material is considered as a matter of design choice depended on its suitability for the intended use and/or the availability of the material, wherein no stated problem is solved or any new or unexpected result achieved, since it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the type of material used in Mills as modified by Thomson et al..

For claim 5, as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention except for the use of the continuous phase comprises a

crystalline polyolefin selected from the group consisting of polyethylene, polypropylene, or copolymers, and mixtures thereof. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include the continuous phase comprises a crystalline polyolefin selected from the group consisting of polyethylene, polypropylene, or copolymers, and mixtures thereof, since using another type material is considered as a matter of design choice depended on its suitability for the intended use and/or the availability of the material, wherein no stated problem is solved or any new or unexpected result achieved, since it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the type of material used in Mills as modified by Thomson et al..

For claim 7, as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention except for the use a core material and a partial surface coating material. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include the use of a core material and a partial surface coating material, since using another type material is considered as a matter of design choice depended on its suitability for the intended use and/or the availability of the material, wherein no stated problem is solved or any new or unexpected result achieved, since it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the type of material used in Mills as modified by Thomson et al..

For claim 8 (as best understood), as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention except for the core material has a

tan 6 < 0,20. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified Thomson et al. so as to include the core material has a tan 6 < 0,20, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

For claim 9, as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention except for the use of the core material is an SBS or SEBS, and the surface coating is an EPDM based TPV or NBR. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include the core material is an SBS or SEBS, and the surface coating is an EPDM based TPV or NBR, since using another type material is considered as a matter of design choice depended on its suitability for the intended use and/or the availability of the material, wherein no stated problem is solved or any new or unexpected result achieved, since it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the type of material used in Mills as modified by Thomson et al..

For claim 10, as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention except for said first portion is made from a material exhibiting a higher stiffness/hardness than said further portion. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include said first portion is made from a material exhibiting a higher stiffness/hardness than said

further portion, since using another type material is considered as a matter of design choice depended on its suitability for the intended use and/or the availability of the material, wherein no stated problem is solved or any new or unexpected result achieved, since it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the type of material used in Mills as modified by Thomson et al..

For claim 11, as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention except for the material exhibiting a higher stiffness/hardness is a hard EPDM based TPV or a hard NBR based TPV, TPU, TPA or TEEE, and the softer part is a soft EPDM based TPV or a soft NBR based TPV. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include the material exhibiting a higher stiffness/hardness is a hard EPDM based TPV or a hard NBR based TPV, TPU, TPA or TEEE, and the softer part is a soft EPDM based TPV or a soft NBR based TPV, since using another type material is considered as a matter of design choice depended on its suitability for the intended use and/or the availability of the material, wherein no stated problem is solved or any new or unexpected result achieved, since it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the type of material used in Mills as modified by Thomson et al..

For claim 12, as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention except for a service temperature between -60 and +200°C. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified

Thomson et al. so as to include a service temperature between -60 and +200°C, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

For claim 17 (as best understood), as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention except for the use of a specific material that is resistant to chlorine, ozone and to UV irradiation and thermal oxidation. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include a material that is resistant to chlorine, ozone and to UV irradiation and thermal oxidation, since using another type material is considered as a matter of design choice depended on its suitability for the intended use and/or the availability of the material, wherein no stated problem is solved or any new or unexpected result achieved, since it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the type of material used in Mills as modified by Thomson et al..

For claim 18 (as best understood), as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention (note that the material in Mills as modified by Thomson et al. is inherently exhibited the property of tear strength therein) except for said material or combination of materials exhibits a tear strength between 5 and 50 kN/m. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include a material or combination of materials exhibits a tear strength between 5 and 50 kN/m, since it has been held that where the general

conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

For claim 19 (as best understood), as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention (note that the material in Mills as modified by Thomson et al. is inherently exhibited the property of tensile strength therein) except for the tensile strength of said material or combination of materials is 0.5-40 MPa. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include a material or combination of materials exhibits a tensile strength of 0.5-40 MPa, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

For claim 20 (as best understood), as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention (note that the material in Mills as modified by Thomson et al. is inherently exhibited the property of elongation therein) except for the elongation of said material or combination of materials is more than 200% before breakage. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified Thomson et al. so as to include the elongation of said material or combination of materials is more than 200% before breakage, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

For claim 22, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. further disclose a teat cup liner, adapted to be positioned on/over a teat in a close fit, comprising a head portion (2), a sleeve (11) and a milk tube (10) integrated in a unitary structure.

For claim 28, as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention except for the use of the polyolefin which is selected from the group consisting of HDPE, LDPE, and LLDPE. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include the polyolefin which is selected from the group consisting of HDPE, LDPE, and LLDPE, since using another type material is considered as a matter of design choice depended on its suitability for the intended use and/or the availability of the material, wherein no stated problem is solved or any new or unexpected result achieved, since it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the type of material used in Mills as modified by Thomson et al..

For claim 29, as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention (note that the material in Mills as modified by Thomson et al. is inherently exhibited the property of tear strength therein) except for said material or combination of materials exhibits a tear strength between 15-35 kN/m. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include a material or combination of materials exhibits a tear strength between

15-35kN/m, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

For claim 30, as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention (note that the material in Mills as modified by Thomson et al. is inherently exhibited the property of tensile strength therein) except for the tensile strength of said material or combination of materials is 5-20 MPa. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified by Thomson et al. so as to include a material or combination of materials exhibits a tensile strength of 5-20 MPa, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

For claim 31, as described above, Mills as modified by Thomson et al. disclose most of the claimed invention (note that the material in Mills as modified by Thomson et al. is inherently exhibited the property of elongation therein) except for the elongation of said material or combination of materials is more than 300% before breakage. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the material of Mills as modified Thomson et al. so as to include the elongation of said material or combination of materials is more than 300% before breakage, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a

claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1,17-23, and 29-31 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of copending Application No. 11/597,716. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 (narrower) of the application "anticipates" claim 1 (broader) of the copending Application No. 11/597,716. Accordingly, the application claim 1 are not patentably distinct from the copending Application No. 11/597,716 claim 1, since the application claim 1 requires elements (i.e., "a) a hardness between 25 shore A and 50 shore D; b) a Young's modulus between 0.i MPa and 50 MPa; c) a tensile strength above 0.5 MPa; and d) a minimum elongation of 50% without breakage") while the copending Application No. 11/597,716 claim 1 does not. Thus it is apparent that the more specific application

claim 1 encompasses the copending Application No. 11/597,716 claim 1. Following the rationale in In re Goodman cited in the preceding paragraph, where applicant has once been filed an application or granted a patent containing a claim for the specific or narrower invention, applicant may not then obtain a second application or patent with a claim for the generic or broader invention without first submitting an appropriate terminal disclaimer.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,3-12,17-22, and 28-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. With respect to Applicant's Double Patenting argument, it is noted that MPEP 804 I B 1 stated if a "provisional" nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting (ODP) rejection is the only rejection remaining in the earlier filed (i.e., the present application) of the two pending applications, then the examiner should withdraw that rejection and permit the earlier-filed application to issue as a patent without a terminal disclaimer. However, this is not the case, it is noted that the earlier filed application (i.e., the present application) is rejectable on the other grounds as well and therefore the examiner should not withdraw the rejection and permit the earlier-filed application to issue as a patent without a terminal disclaimer.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trinh T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 P.M to 6:00 P.M).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Mansen can be reached on (571) 272-6608. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Trinh T Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3644